

AFT



AFL

CIO

Vol. 2, No. 1

BERKELEY 1474 FACULTY UNION

News

October 21, 1971

#### PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Welcome back to Berkeley! 1474 needs you!

During the fine summer we have worked to set up the new office, attended the AFT convention, continued to press Vice President Taylor on Section 52, and tried to anticipate the mood, concerns and problems of faculty and academic staff this fall.

Prior to the convention, Goodman (Davis), Blackburn (UCLA) and I wrote and circulated to all the State College officers a document describing the history of our discontent with UPC. It was a pretty devastating critique, especially of financial affairs. We hold it responsible for Sam Bottone's return to UC, because, if we had asked the questions raised in our report in an even more public fashion, the repercussions would have been great. Copies of the report are available from the office for any interested member.

If we are to maintain the present level of operation after Sam's contract with UPC terminates in February, we must seek financing from the national AFT. This can best be done for UC as a whole by a formally chartered Council, and we think our chances of getting aid are pretty good--but if, and only if, we show membership growth in the form of a doubling between now and January. Increasing the membership is the highest-priority concern of all the UC local officers.

There is little doubt that we, the UC AFT locals, have stopped the administration's attempts to rewrite Section 52 of the Administrative Manual dealing with the appointment and retention of Assistant Professors. Now, belatedly, officers of several Senate divisions have become aware of the threat to faculty power and have requested copies of the analyses we prepared last spring. We are currently formulating a statement of general principles, such as the requirement that reasons be given for failure to continue an appointment, etc.

Vice President Taylor has refused to meet with us again on Section 52 (we had one brief session in the spring) and has ignored our recent letters. The University has a policy that campus and statewide administrators must meet and confer with employee organizations; we believe Taylor is in violation of this policy. Even though Section 52 may be stalemated, we continue to press on this important principle by informing Hitch, friendly legislators and labor leaders of this lack of good faith. It is essential that we not have to fight the battle to meet and confer over each and every issue as it arises.

This year we expect that the teaching load and other aspects of our working conditions will begin the battle of the '70s. Very little factual information is available so far because the

results of the State audit have not yet appeared. Preliminary information suggests that the auditor's report is a political rather than an actuarial document. You should expect some bomb-shells. And soon, too.

As I said, welcome back. Join the battle by getting a new member today!

Patricia St. Lawrence

#### WHILE YOU WERE AWAY...

..Among those votes returned (about 40% of the membership), support for withdrawal from UPC was almost unanimous. The UC locals began functioning as an informal Council this summer.

..Sam Bottone has returned to work as Executive Secretary of the UC Council. Mike Friedman is office secretary for the Council and for 1474. The office at 2510 Channing Way is open weekdays 9-1 and 2-5.

..The 1971-72 Executive Committee has taken office. Officers are: P. St. Lawrence (Genetics), President; Michael Scriven (Philosophy), Vice President; and T. Gurney (Mol. Biology), Secretary-Treasurer. Councillors are: G. Benveniste (Education), Barbara Lena (Cowell Hospital), Anne Middleton (English), M. Nestle (Cont. Educ. of the Bar), G. Rochlin (Physics), J. Sackman (Civil Engineering), C. Sellers (History), W. Simmons (Anthropology), D. Vial (Inst. of Industrial Relations), and A. Wilson (Biochemistry). St. Lawrence and Wilson are the delegates to the Central Labor Council. The Executive Committee meets irregularly on Thursdays at noon in Room C, Golden Bear. All members are invited but should call the office for information about the next meeting and to submit items for the agenda.

..The faculty code of conduct which took much of our attention last year has been referred to Vice President McCorkle for review and possible revision. Rumors fly that, among other changes, a specific prohibition of strikes will be added.

..An extraordinary interest in Collective Bargaining has appeared in faculty circles this fall. The Chairman of the UCLA Senate advocated it at the opening meeting of the year. Passage of a CB bill for school teachers appears a real possibility; legislators are said to have recognized that teacher strikes can be averted only if there is genuine collective bargaining.

#### YOUR NEWS

AFT 1474 News enters upon its second year of highly irregular publication with a renewed call for contributions by members. Bring or send material to the AFT office, 2510 Channing Way. Accounts of departmental happenings, art work, gripes--anything is acceptable. But please, pay your dues.

Coby Lubliner

One of the objections most frequently heard from Union and non-Union faculty alike to last year's formulation of a code of ethics by the Academic Senate and the administration was that it was unnecessary because a well-recognized code had always existed. The code governing professionals in the health sciences is not only more explicit than the heretofore internalized code of conduct for professors, but has received legal and societal acceptance, sanction and support.

A cardinal point is the recognition that communication between patient and therapist is privileged. This is the issue that has led the social workers, psychologists and psychiatrists who work in the Psychiatry Clinic at Cowell to put their jobs on the line by refusing to continue to participate in a practice which has led to breaches of confidentiality. Specifically, the objecting professionals claim that the supervisors to whom they are required to reveal details of cases do not observe confidentiality and transmit information about students beyond the confines of the clinic. Not only is this a serious breach of professional ethics, it damages the patient-therapist relationship and makes it impossible for the therapists to do the work they are supposed, and desire, to do.

There is also an issue here of self-determination in relation to conditions of work. The professionals who are refusing to discuss their cases represent a wide spectrum of psychological and psychiatric philosophies, schools, approaches and therapies. In the past (some of the employees have worked at the clinic for 20 years), these differences have been recognized and accepted by employees and supervisors, and consultation with supervisors has not led to disharmony. Now, a uniform approach to therapy - the approach advocated by Dr. Harvey Powelson, Clinic Director - is being imposed. This approach is rejected by the workers in the clinic. (Perhaps Governor Reagan's attempt to define teaching as only hours in a classroom can be seen as an analogous intrusion into another profession.)

It is important to emphasize that the Cowell Hospital employees do not refuse supervision per se; they do refuse to consult with supervisors who breach professional ethics and/or whom they do not respect. Nor has the decision to refuse supervision been hasty or intemperate; attempts to rectify the administration of the clinic have been made over a period of two years. During this time, there have been numerous investigations by committees from within and without the University. In July 1970, a group of prominent Bay Area psychiatrists recommended to Chancellor Heyns extensive administrative reform of the clinic including the replacement of Dr. Powelson. None of these attempts has been successful, and the continuing deterioration of the clinic finally provoked its employees to direct action.

Note from the President: The courageous action taken by the members of the clinic at Cowell Hospital and the issues raised of professional ethics in a bureaucracy deserve serious consideration by every Union member. Ironically, though all members of the clinic have advanced degrees, they are classified as nonacademic employees and consequently have no direct access to the Academic Senate, Privilege and Tenure nor to the excellent grievance procedure for non-Senate academics. Local 1474, like most educational Unions, stands not only for economic benefits to the profession but for the right of academic personnel to have a determining role in formulating the conditions and obligations of their professional lives;

as much as the faculty, the clinic workers can be said to be educators - in the old true sense of a docere. I therefore urge all members to support the Cowell Hospital employees.

P. St. L.

## 2 ANOTHER CAMPUS STRIKE?

The Stationary Engineers Union Local 3 (the people who run the steam plant, etc.) was granted strike sanction against the University at a meeting of the Alameda County Central Labor Council Executive Board on October 8. The sanction is held by Executive Secretary Richard Groulx pending further negotiation.

The Engineers Union had a "letter of understanding" (the nearest thing to a contract granted by UC) whose three-year period expired on July 1. Negotiations for an increase dragged on past this date, but eventually all issues were resolved, except that the University refused to make the increase retroactive to July 1. According to F.X. (Pete) Small of the Berkeley Campus Personnel Office, the University has no funds for a retroactive increase, the only budgeted increases being in utilities and health plan contributions. The Union disputes this claim, and furthermore feels that the University relinquished budgetary control to the Governor who makes political use of it to the detriment of all workers.

Stationary Engineers on other campuses likewise will request strike sanction from their respective Labor Councils.

## A STANDING COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC MINORITIES (CAM)

Heaven forbid that 1474 ever dissolve into a system of committees, but perhaps we really do need one standing committee concerned with all those persons against whom academe discriminates because of race, sex, etc.

The Union played an important role in the creation of the Ethnic Studies Department several years ago. That department, alas, has never been given the status and support most of us thought it would be accorded and has been in a state of malnutrition (if not starvation) ever since it was created. Some Union members have sporadically participated in rescue operations at times of crisis. Things are bad there again.

Last spring the Union co-signed the complaint which was responsible for bringing HEW onto the campus to investigate discrimination against women. The investigatory phase of HEW's work is now almost complete, and the investigators will be moving into negotiations with the University on affirmative action programs. The Union should develop positions to present to HEW for consideration.

Also last spring, the Union co-signed another complaint to HEW. This was initiated by the Chicano Mesa Directiva, a group of Chicano students and instructors. As soon as the Women's complaint is finished, HEW will take up the Chicano complaint.

The experience at other Universities is that additional pressure must be exerted after agreements between the administration and HEW are signed in order to ensure that affirmative actions are implemented. This has required grievances and suits by individuals. I anticipate that the Union will want to be the watchdog over the implementation of positive action in the future.

For all these reasons, the Executive Committee has created a standing Committee on Academic Minorities (CAM) and Anne Middleton, English, has agreed to act as Chairwoman. Those who wish to work on, or contribute to, the Committee should call her at 2-2323.

Patricia St. Lawrence